

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1692nd  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 5 November 1969,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 48:

Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development  
(continued)

Part III: Means and methods (continued)

Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 18 (concluded) .....	225
Paragraph 20 .....	226
Paragraph 21 .....	226
Paragraph 22 .....	226
Proposed new paragraph after paragraph 22 .....	227
Paragraph 23 .....	228

*Chairman:* Mrs. Turkia OULD DADDAH  
(Mauritania).

**AGENDA ITEM 48**

**Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development  
(continued) (A/7235 and Add.1 and 2, A/7648, A/C.3/  
L.1697, A/C.3/L.1698, A/C.3/L.1701, A/C.3/L.1706,  
A/C.3/L.1707, A/C.3/L.1710-1712, A/C.3/L.1714,  
A/C.3/L.1716, A/C.3/L.1718/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1720,  
A/C.3/L.1723, A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1726,  
A/C.3/L.1729, A/C.3/L.1730 and Corr.1 and 2)**

**PART III: MEANS AND METHODS (continued)**

*Proposed new paragraphs after paragraph 18 (concluded)*

1. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), explaining his vote at the preceding meeting on the first new paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1, said that, in view of the divergence of the interests of workers and employers, it was impossible for harmonious industrial relations to exist. Furthermore, the term "industrial relations" might be interpreted to mean relations between industries, which were totally irrelevant to the draft Declaration. He had therefore voted against the proposal.

2. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had been obliged to vote against the first new paragraph in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1 because he believed that the draft Declaration should be addressed to the ordinary man everywhere and should reflect the views of all countries. Harmonious industrial relations were not possible between the working class and capitalist managements; they were only possible when, after radical social changes, society ensured that workers fully enjoyed the fruits of their labour.

3. Mr. MOUSSA (United Arab Republic) said that he had voted for the new paragraph since it in no way precluded

the right of workers to participate in management—a procedure which was most conducive to the solution of labour problems.

4. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda) said that he had abstained from voting because, in his view, the new paragraph was capable of too many interpretations. Furthermore, it was incompatible with his delegation's belief that the first stage in the settlement of labour disputes should be voluntary negotiations between employers, employees and trade unions.

5. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) said that he had abstained because the new paragraph was predicated on the assumption that industrial relations were always intrinsically inharmonious. That was true only in non-socialist societies, where workers did not benefit fully from their work. When the workers themselves constituted the management, there were no conflicts.

6. Mrs. BLACK (United States of America) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the new paragraph because it recognized the invaluable role played by trade unions in the development of harmonious industrial relations.

7. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that his delegation had voted for the new paragraph, although it had preferred the original version set out in document A/C.3/L.1724. In his view, the term "industrial relations" was too restrictive, since it might be thought not to include employer-employee relations in commerce, agriculture and public administration.

8. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he had voted against the new paragraph because its provisions were too vague. Measures which certain sectors of society might consider "appropriate" could actually restrict the rights of workers. Furthermore, his delegation did not believe that harmonious industrial relations could be achieved in a society where the working class and the managerial class were separate.

9. Mrs. RAATIKAINEN (Finland), introducing on behalf of the sponsors the second new paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1, said that, as the Committee had approved the inclusion in part II of the draft Declaration of a paragraph relating to the protection of children and the welfare of working mothers, part III should contain provisions for the establishment of child-care facilities.

10. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said it was wrong to suggest that the sole purpose of establishing nurseries and similar facilities was to promote the participation of parents in the

development of the society. He therefore proposed that the text should read:

“Establishment of appropriate child-care facilities in the interest of children and working parents”.

11. Mrs. BLACK (United States of America) supported the French oral sub-amendment since the text proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1 might imply that mothers had an obligation to work outside their homes. If a woman who had children wanted to engage in outside work, the necessary child-care facilities should indeed be provided, but such women should be allowed to decide freely whether they wished to avail themselves of those facilities.

12. Mrs. NØRTHEN (Denmark) said that the sponsors had wished to refer both to children and to parents because child-care facilities served a dual purpose. On the one hand, nurseries and kindergartens enabled parents to participate in the working life of the nation, and, on the other hand, they served a pedagogical function where the children were concerned. On behalf of the sponsors, she accepted the French sub-amendment.

*The second new paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1724/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted unanimously.*

#### Paragraph 20

13. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland), introducing the Polish-Syrian amendment to paragraph 20 contained in document A/C.3/L.1698 said that in the contemporary world there were many approaches to social research, and a vast amount of such research was being undertaken by many countries. Perhaps one of the most noteworthy developments was the results obtained from research in the socialist countries, where social progress and development were being achieved under totally new economic and social conditions. The problems of a comprehensive approach to social research, involving town and country planning and arrangements for taking industry to the people and not vice versa, were being solved scientifically in those countries. In order to ensure that the experience gained by various countries might be effectively utilized by others, it was desirable to promote comparative international research.

14. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy), introducing the Italian amendment to paragraph 20 (A/C.3/L.1718/Rev.1, para. 2), said that, in view of the complexity of social phenomena, there should be sufficient basic research to ensure that the factors underlying various social situations—for example, cultural factors—were duly taken into account. Indeed, if the basic research was not done, there could be no sound basis for applied social research. It was therefore necessary to insert a reference to basic research in paragraph 20.

*The Italian amendment (A/C.3/L.1718/Rev.1, para. 2) was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

*The Polish-Syrian amendment in document A/C.3/L.1698, was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 20 (see A/7648, annex II), as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

#### Paragraph 21

15. The CHAIRMAN noted that the sole purpose of the amendment to paragraph 21 in document A/C.3/L.1723 was to bring the text of the paragraph into line with the title of the draft Declaration.

*The amendment was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 21 (see A/7648, annex II), as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

16. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that he had abstained from voting on the amendment because he did not think it necessary continually to repeat the full title of the draft Declaration.

#### Paragraph 22

17. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) said that his delegation's first amendment to paragraph 22 (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 4 (a)) was designed to bring the wording into line with the other paragraphs. With regard to the second amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 4(b)), he pointed out that at present many developing countries were not in a position to obtain the financial assistance required to promote their economic and social development, because of the terms on which such assistance was offered. Interest rates were high and other restrictions were imposed. They therefore needed to secure long-term loans, at lower rates of interest, preferably repayable in local products, and technical assistance at low cost or free of charge, in order to accelerate their economic and social development.

18. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), introducing on behalf of the sponsors the amendment to paragraph 22 in document A/C.3/L.1723, said that its purpose was to stress the importance of national objectives. The Committee had already acknowledged that all multilateral assistance plans should be based on the objectives of national plans. The sponsors had revised their amendment and proposed that the words “national social development plans” in the original text of paragraph 22 should be replaced by “the social objectives of national development plans”.

19. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that the amendment to paragraph 22 in document A/C.3/L.1723 improved the logic of the original text by referring not to the achievement of national development plans but to the achievement of their objectives.

20. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) asked whether the Iraqi delegation, which had submitted amendments to paragraph 22 (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 4) and also an amendment calling for a new paragraph to follow paragraph 22 (*ibid*, para. 6), would consider combining those amendments in a single comprehensive paragraph, as their objectives were similar.

21. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) said that his delegation wished to maintain the separate amendments. The Committee had agreed to the inclusion in part II of a separate paragraph relating to the elimination of all forms of foreign economic exploitation, and his delegation was of the opinion that

there should be a separate complementary paragraph in part III.

22. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) observed that assistance was sometimes required by the developing countries not only for the achievement of social objectives but also in the formulation of national plans. She asked whether the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 would consider replacing the words "for the achievement of the social objectives" by "in the planning and execution".

23. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that, although it was true that assistance was needed occasionally during the planning phase, the principal goal of the developing countries was to achieve the social objectives of their national development plans.

*The Iraqi amendments to paragraph 22 (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 4) were adopted by 91 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*The amendment to paragraph 22 in document A/C.3/L.1723, as orally revised, was adopted unanimously.*

*Paragraph 22 (see A/7648, annex II), as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

#### *Proposed new paragraph after paragraph 22*

24. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq), introducing his delegation's amendment for the addition of a new paragraph after paragraph 22 (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 6), said that the Committee had already adopted in part II a provision for the elimination of all forms of foreign economic exploitation, particularly that practised by international monopolies, and part III should suggest means for attaining that objective. The natural resources of most of the developing countries were exploited by foreign monopolies under contracts or concessions which had been concluded or granted under the old colonial régimes. In fact, foreign enterprises and monopolies accounted for at least 50 per cent of the profits from the national production of the less advanced countries. For example, from a capital investment of approximately \$8,000 million in the Middle East, foreign petroleum monopolies derived annual profits of about \$2,000 million, which went to countries that were already highly developed. Wealth did not entitle a country to dominate the life and the natural resources of another, and it was not just to allow such monopolies to exploit the natural resources of the developing countries and leave their populations living in poverty.

25. Direct national exploitation of a country's resources was of benefit to the whole population and led to further national development. Most of the developing countries, whose national resources were of vital importance to their economies, wished to undertake such a course, but they needed technical and financial assistance in order to do so. Their expectations of raising the standard of living and closing the gap between the developed and the developing countries had not been realized, owing, in particular, to the difficulty of obtaining financial and other assistance. Greater attention should be given to the discovery and exploitation of natural resources, and due account should be taken of the role of national authorities in planning and

development, reaffirming the principle of the sovereignty of the developing countries over their own resources. Iraq therefore suggested the adoption of certain methods which would allow them to exploit their national wealth for the full benefit of their peoples.

26. He had revised his amendment to read:

"The provision to the developing countries of technical, financial and material assistance or favourable conditions to facilitate the direct exploitation of their national resources and natural wealth by those countries with a view to enabling the peoples of those countries to benefit fully from their national resources."

27. Mr. BASCON (Bolivia) said that he whole-heartedly supported the Iraqi proposal. His country had been a constant victim of foreign exploitation, the result of which had been poverty.

28. Miss ARGUELLO (Nicaragua), Mr. DIOGO (Dahomey) and Mr. BABAA (Libya) said that they strongly supported the amendment.

29. Mr. PAOLINI (France) expressed complete agreement with the substance of the proposal. Nevertheless, the first lines were merely a repetition of a text which had already been adopted, and he asked whether the representative of Iraq would consider deleting the first part of the text and making appropriate changes in the remainder of the amendment.

30. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) said it would be obvious from his delegation's statements in the Committee that the United Kingdom fully understood the position of the developing countries. At the same time, he agreed with the representative of France; the truth of an affirmation was not made any greater by repetition, and he wondered how the text would read to persons who had not been present during the debate. The idea expressed in the first lines had been stated on no fewer than four occasions. He therefore appealed to the representative of Iraq to delete the first part of the text, ending with the word "conditions", and to make the necessary drafting changes in the last part, to which his delegation had no objection.

31. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that he had no difficulty in supporting the idea underlying the Iraqi amendment. Nevertheless, as the representative of France had said, the first lines repeated other formulations contained in the draft Declaration. On the other hand, if the first part of the text was deleted, the remaining words would not indicate who was to facilitate the direct exploitation of the national resources of the developing countries. In paragraph 22, it was obvious from the context that technical, financial and material assistance to the developing countries would be provided by those countries which were in a position to furnish such aid. Unless it was possible to attach the last part of the amendment to the end of another paragraph which started with the same wording, the idea it stated would remain but a pious hope.

32. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom) agreed with the representative of Iran and suggested that the second half of the formulation might be placed at the end of paragraph 22.

33. Miss ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) said that a comparison of the amendment under consideration with paragraph 13 of part II showed that the only repetition lay in the statement, in the last part of the proposed text, that the peoples of the countries in question should benefit fully from their national resources. Part II dealt with objectives, and the Iraqi formulation, which constituted a means, must of necessity have a place in part III.

34. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) said that he could not agree with the comments concerning the first part of his proposed text. The provision of technical, financial and material assistance on favourable conditions, so as to enable the developing countries to exploit their national resources, was a most important part of the proposal and could not be omitted.

*The Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1711, para. 6), as orally revised, was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.*

35. Mr. ARCHER (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that he had abstained from voting on the Iraqi amendment because he believed that the Committee must accept serious responsibility for the text it was drawing up.

36. Mr. LEW (China) said that he had also abstained, because the formula "The provision to" failed to indicate how and by whom the assistance was to be furnished.

37. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that he had voted in favour of the amendment, despite his earlier remarks. Nevertheless, he still felt that the formulation was illogical and suggested that, when the Committee came to rearrange the provisions of parts II and III, it should group together those articles which started with the same introductory phrase, in an endeavour to arrive at some coherence.

38. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that, although he agreed with the substance of the amendment, he had been obliged to abstain, since it was impossible to vote for a wording which made the form of the entire draft Declaration unsatisfactory and the task of restructuring it increasingly difficult. If such a tendency continued, his delegation would be unable to endorse the text for submission to the General Assembly.

#### *Paragraph 23*

39. Mr. PECHACEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1701) applied also to the proposal relating to paragraph 23 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 and was concerned more with form than with substance. If general and complete disarmament was not effective, it could in no sense be regarded as disarmament, and the word "effective" was therefore superfluous.

40. Mr. KALANGARI (Uganda), introducing the amendment to paragraph 23 contained in document A/C.3/L.1723 on behalf of the sponsors, said that an attempt had been made to improve on the text of the original draft by stressing the importance of releasing resources progressively and channelling them towards economic and social progress, instead of waiting until the disarmament process was completed. In addition, although those resources would be intended for the welfare of people everywhere, the idea

that they should be for the benefit of the developing countries in particular had been introduced.

41. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had submitted its amendment (A/C.3/L.1706) in order not only to emphasize the importance of general and complete disarmament, but also to indicate specific measures that could advance the attainment of that goal. However, in view of the similarity between his text and the amendment to paragraph 23 in document A/C.3/L.1723, he wondered whether the sponsors of the latter would be willing to incorporate his amendment at the end of their text, which might then read:

"... for the benefit of developing countries; the promotion of measures contributing to disarmament, including the complete prohibition of nuclear tests, the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and the prevention of the pollution of oceans and inland waters by nuclear wastes".

42. Mr. DUARTE (Brazil) said that, while the ultimate goal was clearly general and complete disarmament, it must be admitted that that ideal was not likely to be achieved in the near future. In fact, the idea of general and complete disarmament seemed to have been superseded in the minds of the great Powers by the concept of arms control and limitations. For that reason, paragraph 23 of the original text (see A/7648, annex II) seemed to him to be unrealistic. Nevertheless, while general and complete disarmament was undoubtedly the final goal, disarmament itself was a dynamic process in the course of which it should be possible for the resources released from limited disarmament to be used progressively for economic and social progress, particularly in the developing countries. Since the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 embodied that idea, he would support it.

43. Miss MUTER (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, said that it had long been recognized that arms production wasted human and natural resources that could be used for economic and social development. A declaration stating the intention of the Governments of the States Members of the United Nations, when sufficient progress had been made in internationally supervised world-wide disarmament, to devote a portion of the savings achieved to an international fund (which would have been the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED)), to assist development and reconstruction in under-developed countries (General Assembly resolution 724 A (VIII)) had been adopted as early as the eighth session of the General Assembly; yet disarmament was still remote, and poverty and hunger were still very real. Governments should therefore be reminded that even modest steps towards disarmament could do much to alleviate misery in the world. The sponsors of the amendment recognized that progress towards general and complete disarmament was necessarily slow, but felt that resources for economic and social development could be released progressively as advances were made. The fact that some \$200,000 million was now being spent annually on armaments had been an important factor in the failure of the First United Nations Development Decade; with the Second Development

Decade now approaching, a diversion of even a small part of that amount to economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries, would be of incalculable value.

44. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) said that both disarmament and economic and social progress could be more easily achieved if respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States prevailed in the international community and if the threat or use of force and intervention in the internal affairs of States were clearly recognized as inadmissible. If States felt that their sovereignty or territorial integrity was threatened or that they were being subjected to pressure from outside forces, they had no alternative but to sacrifice their economic and social advancement to their defence. Protection from outside threats was therefore a prerequisite for social and economic progress. He wondered whether the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 would consider including that idea in their proposal.

45. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that he would vote in favour of the amendment to paragraph 23 in document A/C.3/L.1723. He agreed with the representative of Czechoslovakia that the word "effective" was superfluous; by the same reasoning, however, the addition of the USSR text (A/C.3/L.1706) to that amendment would be equally superfluous, since general and complete disarmament was a concept complete in itself, which could only be weakened by the enumeration of details.

46. Mrs. BLACK (United States of America) supported the inclusion in the draft Declaration of paragraph 23, of part III, concerning the release of resources for economic and social progress as a consequence of effective general and complete disarmament. Her Government was pleased to note that the preliminary results of its studies and of studies by the United Nations indicated that there would be no insurmountable economic obstacles to the release of such resources if disarmament were effective. It welcomed the prospect that a reduction in armaments would make possible substantial savings which could be used for economic and social purposes and had made clear on many occasions its hope that a portion of such savings could be used for development assistance to other nations. It should be realized, however, that the benefits anticipated could be realized only as a result of the negotiation and execution of effective disarmament agreements.

47. Her delegation did not believe that paragraph 23 should refer to specific disarmament measures, such as the prohibition of nuclear tests mentioned in the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.1706). The negotiation of disarmament agreements was so complex an undertaking that it should be left to the bodies directly concerned. While her delegation agreed with the prohibition of the pollution of oceans and inland waters by nuclear wastes, which was also mentioned in the USSR proposal, it felt that that idea was not pertinent to a paragraph dealing with the economic consequences of disarmament. The General Assembly had already adopted resolution 2467 B (XXIII), which had welcomed the adoption by States of appropriate safeguards against the pollution of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

48. Her delegation therefore urged the adoption of the original text of paragraph 23 of part III (see A/7648, annex II).

49. Mr. DIOGO (Dahomey) said that the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 contained a contradiction in terms because, despite the wishes of its sponsors, it implied that resources would become available for economic and social progress only after general and complete disarmament had been achieved. He therefore suggested that the amendment should be reworded to read: "The achievement of general and complete disarmament and, at each stage of this process, the utilization of the resources progressively released for economic and social progress . . .".

50. Mr. IDDIR (Algeria) said that his delegation could vote only for the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723 as it stood. It could support neither the Czechoslovak amendment nor the USSR amendment, which contradicted that text.

51. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) felt that the USSR amendment, if added to the text in document A/C.3/L.1723, should be placed in the middle of it, rather than at the end, because the main idea of the latter text—the channelling of resources towards economic and social progress—should appear at the end of the paragraph as its culmination. She therefore suggested that the amendment to paragraph 23 might be reworded to read:

"The achievement of general and complete effective disarmament through the promotion of such measures as the complete prohibition of nuclear tests and prohibiting the pollution of oceans and inland waters by nuclear wastes, and the channelling of the resources progressively released thereby towards economic and social progress for the welfare of people everywhere and in particular, for the benefit of the developing countries".

52. Mr. PIPARSANIA (India) said that his delegation, as one of the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, could accept the suggestion made by the representative of Cyprus and the Czechoslovak amendment (A/C.3/L.1701). The intent of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.1706) might be met by the addition of the following text to the end of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723: "the promotion of measures contributing to disarmament, including, *inter alia*, the complete prohibition of all nuclear tests, the manufacture, use and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and chemical weapons and prohibiting pollution of oceans and inland waters by industrial, nuclear substances". In his view the question of pollution by nuclear substances was so important that it deserved inclusion in the paragraph, even at the risk of repetition.

53. Mr. LEW (China) cautioned the Committee against encroaching on the work of other bodies. It was not the province of the Third Committee to discuss disarmament or to advocate specific disarmament measures; all it should do was to point out how social benefits could be derived from disarmament. The essential idea of paragraph 23 was the progressive diversion of resources released by disarmament to social and economic progress. He therefore supported the Dahomean and Jamaican proposals.

54. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her country, which was a member of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, believed that the resources released by disarmament should be used for the economic and social development of the developing countries. She therefore supported the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723. However, she suggested that the sponsors should add to their text two ideas: that disarmament should be, first, balanced, and, second, subject to international control. In her view, the inclusion of the USSR amendment in that text would only weaken it.

55. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation, which was a sponsor of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1723, could agree to the inclusion in it of the Cypriot suggestion.

56. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that his delegation, as a sponsor, could accept the Dahomean and Jamaican suggestions.

57. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) felt that the USSR amendment should be inserted at the beginning of the text in document A/C.3/L.1723, in order to avoid the implication that resources could be released only as a result of the measures advocated in the USSR proposal.

58. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) supported the amendments in documents A/C.3/L.1706 and A/C.3/L.1723, which he felt could be combined, because they represented an expeditious method of giving effect to the sixth paragraph of the preamble. Indeed, the largest potential source of funds for economic and social development was likely to be the resources released by disarmament.

59. Miss MUTER (Indonesia) moved the adjournment of the meeting to afford the sponsors of the various proposals an opportunity for consultations.

*The motion was adopted.*

*The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.*